Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tional function from the other. Thus despite independence proofs, we are able, by means of the *Principia,* to deduce one independent postulate from another, and we have now seen that the difficulties are not set aside by the distinction between propositional functions and propositions.

The only set of independent postulates is one which consists of only one postulate. As soon as two postulates are assumed as the basis of a deductive system, we are able to deduce, as the first theorem, that they are not independent, no matter whether they are propositions or functions.

The conclusion to be drawn from the preceding discussion is that the theory of deduction of the symbolic logicians is not in agreement with the sort of deduction used by the mathematicians.[6] Postulates proved to be independent by the method of independence proofs can be shown to be dependent by the rules of the *Principia.* Either symbolic logic does not furnish safe rules of deduction for pure mathematics, or else mathematicians, who have used independence proofs to show that assumptions are not deductively related, have been wandering in error.

V. F. LENZEN.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

MEDICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF EVOLUTION. By *J. G. Adami, M.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.P.* Pp. xviii, 372. London: Duckworth and Co., 1918. Pris 18s. net.

The first part of this very stimulating book consists of the Croonian Lectures of 1917 delivered before the London Royal College of Physicians on "Adaptation and Disease," and the two other parts, "Heredity and Adaptation" and "On Growth and Overgrowth," are reprints of earlier (1892-1914) papers and addresses by the author which bear upon adaptation and tissue modification. In fact, Dr. Adami found that his earlier work was not known to biologists, and it also seemed useful "to present the conclusions reached, not so much from the point of view of their medical bearing, as from that of their biological significance, in order that both morphologist and physician might observe the direction in which medical research is surely leading us with reference to matters which form the basis of general biology."

[6] The conclusions of this article agree with the criticisms of the *Principia* by Prof. C. I. Lewis. Professor Lewis's algebra of strict implication is the only deductive theory, of which I know, which is in accord with the kind of deduction used by mathematicians in independence proofs.